

E-filed 5/2/07

SCOTT N. SCHOOLS (SC 9990)
United States Attorney

MARK L. KROTOSKI (CASBN 138549)
Chief, Criminal Division

BENJAMIN T. KENNEDY (CASBN 241350)
Assistant United States Attorney

150 Almaden Boulevard
San Jose, California 95113
Telephone: (408) 535-5059
Facsimile: (408) 535-5066
Email: benjamin.t.kennedy@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for the United States of America

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	No. CR 07-00187 JF
)	
Plaintiff,)	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
)	ORDER EXCLUDING TIME FROM
v.)	APRIL 25, 2007 TO MAY 23, 2007 FROM
)	THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
DANIEL E. RANGEL-MARTINEZ,)	CALCULATION (18 U.S.C. §
)	3161(h)(8)(A))
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

On April 25, 2007 the parties appeared for a hearing before this Court. At that hearing, defense counsel requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act based upon defense counsel's need to effectively prepare by reviewing the defendant's A file and other discovery materials submitted by the government. At that time, the Court set the matter for a hearing on May 23, 2007.

The parties stipulate that the time between April 25, 2007 and May 23, 2007 is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §3161, and agree that the failure to grant the requested continuance would unreasonably deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. Finally, the parties agree that the

ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public, and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal cases. 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(A).

DATED: April 25, 2007

SCOTT N. SCHOOLS
United States Attorney

/s/
BENJAMIN T. KENNEDY
Assistant United States Attorney

/s/
LARA VINNARD
Assistant Federal Public Defender

ORDER

Based upon the stipulation of the parties, and for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that the time between April 25, 2007 and May 23, 2007 is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §3161. The court finds that the failure to grant the requested continuance would unreasonably deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. Furthermore, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal cases. The court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(A).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 5/2/07


JEREMY FOGEL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE